



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

Ŀ	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
	09/768,567	01/24/01	WALKER	J	96-001XX

T022927 WALKER DIGITAL FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK STAMFORD CT 06905

ii

QM12/1109

SAGER, M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3713 //

DATE MAILED:

11/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Interview Summary

Application No. **09/768,567**

Applicant(s)

Walker et al

Examiner

Sager

Group Art Unit 3713



	personnel):				
(1) Sager	(3)				
(2) Ms. Madalena Fincham	(4)				
Date of Interview Nov 6, 2001	_				
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🗵 No. If yes, brief description:				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached	d. g) $igtie igthigm$ was not reached. h) $igsqcup igchind ighta igchind igchind igchind igchind igchind igchind igchi$				
Substance of Interview including description of the general					
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments:	al nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability	al nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability prosecution (including parent/grand-parent) for reiterating	al nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to teachings of Thacher for network of electronic game devices				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability prosecution (including parent/grand-parent) for reiterating continuously accumulating play data for each player/game	al nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to teachings of Thacher for network of electronic game devices be device and for accumulating game data for use in subsequent				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability prosecution (including parent/grand-parent) for reiterating continuously accumulating play data for each player/game tournament/game and Liverance teaches effecting a game	of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to teachings of Thacher for network of electronic game devices a device and for accumulating game data for use in subsequent a device while a player plays. Exr maintains that combination				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability prosecution (including parent/grand-parent) for reiterating continuously accumulating play data for each player/game tournament/game and Liverance teaches effecting a game suggests a network of Liverance type game devices which	of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to teachings of Thacher for network of electronic game devices electroe and for accumulating game data for use in subsequent electroe while a player plays. Exr maintains that combination the effects game play for each player while each player plays				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: Ms. Fincham requested interview to discuss patentability prosecution (including parent/grand-parent) for reiterating continuously accumulating play data for each player/game tournament/game and Liverance teaches effecting a game suggests a network of Liverance type game devices which which in effect influences game play of the tournament be	of proposed claimed invention. Exr directed counsel to teachings of Thacher for network of electronic game devices a devcie and for accumulating game data for use in subsequent a device while a player plays. Exr maintains that combination				

i) 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

MARK SAGER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Memo to Examiner Sager

From: Magdalena Fincham on behalf of Walker Digital

RE: Application No. 09/768,567; specifically rejection of claims 105-114.

105. A method of conducting a distributed electronic tournament for a plurality of players, comprising exchanging information between a central controller and a player located remotely from the central controller, the information (i) being exchanged while the player plays a game in the tournament and (ii) influencing game play of the tournament, thereby influencing game play of a plurality of players participating in the tournament in order to increase the probability that there is only one winner of the tournament; and

storing in a database player information associated with the player, the stored player information being available for use in a subsequent to an ament.

112. An apparatus for conducting a distributed electronic tournament for a plurality of players, comprising: means for exchanging information between a central controller and a player located remotely from the central controller, the information (i) being exchanged while the player plays a game in the tournament, and (ii) influencing game play; and

means for storing in a database player information associated with the player, the stored player information [being available for use] to be used in a subsequent tournament to influence game play of the subsequent tournament while the player is a playing a game in the subsequent tournament.

Remarks:

Claims 105 - 114 were rejected over Thacher in view of Liverance or instant background disclosure.

Claim 105: None of this art teaches or suggests game play of one player, exchanged while the player is participating in a tournament composed of a plurality of players, influencing game play of the tournament, as claimed in the amended claim 105. Liverance does not disclose a tournament composed of a plurality of players, much less the player's game influencing play of the tournament. Similarly, neither Thacher nor the instant background disclosure teaches or suggests influencing game play of a tournament based on such information in order to increase the probability that there is only one winner of the tournament.

Claim 112: Neither Thacher nor Liverance teaches storing information exchanged between a player participating in a tournament and a central controller for use in influencing game play of a subsequent tournament. While Liverance teaches use of a player handicap to adjust a final score of a subsequent game, Liverance does not teach or suggest influencing game play in a subsequent game. Adjusting a final score is not equivalent or suggestive of influencing game play while the player is playing a game. Similarly, neither Thacher nor the instant background disclosure teach or suggest such a feature.